VIEWS
ON THE SEPARATION

of the

Linguistic Provinces

"Gopal Bagh"
COIMBATORE

23—9—1948

VIEWS
ON THE SEPARATION

of the

Linguistic Provinces

"Gopal Bagh"
COIMBATORE

23—9—1948

Views on the Separation of the Linguistic Provinces

This booklet contains the speeches delivered by Mr G. D. Naidu, Mr K. Nanjundiah, Mr C. Subramaniam, Mr N. Lakshmanan, Rao Bahadur C. M. Ramachandran Chettiar, Mr N. J. Rajagopal and Mr M. Thirugnanasambandam on September 23, 1948, in the presence of a large and distinguished gathering, when they were invited to meet the Linguistic Provinces Commission at a tea party at "Gopal Bagh", Avanashi Road, Coimbatore.

Mr G. D. NAIDU

Friends,

I am very sorry to inform you that the Chairman, Secretary and Members of the Linguistic Provinces Commission were not able to be here as arranged in time for this party on account of unexpected engagements. But all members promised to be here tomorrow evening. On account of the short time I was not able to inform you of the adjournment or continuation of the meeting for tomorrow. In order to have discussions and decisions we have got enough time till tomorrow and the meeting will continue tomorrow at this time. Hence I request you all personally to join the meeting tomorrow also. Though I do not want to express my opinion in the course of official enquiry, I am glad to express my views without any prejudice or fear here.

It is true that the Linguistic area problem has been discussed particularly by some Andhras in South India for a very long time. At the same time nobody cared for this for a long time. Subsequently separation of Dravida Nad also was started by Tamil leaders. Naturally this also was not cared for in the beginning. Of course now in South India the propagation has become very strong particularly among Andhras and Tamils While Kerala and Karnataka followed suit in the South, Mahratta and Gujerat also wanted separation. The reasons for this strong propaganda are the separation of Pakistan and the fight among the leaders for attaining top

positions. Unfortunately after the war the Government also became weak in spite of its being independent. The corruption and other defects have grown up and filled up to the brim which have been used for the propaganda of the leaders who are for separation.

Unfortunately either the government or the public or the leaders are not inclined or not able to find out ways and means to put down corruption and maladministration of several sections. They have taken them as weapons and means to achieve the separation of provinces in order to get some more seats for themselves and their parties in the top positions

The natural opportunities or weapons for the debaters on the subject of linguistic provinces are, apart from the weakness of the Government, corruption and bad administration, literacy and illiteracy. Perhaps at present there may not be more than 15% of the people educated in our country. From this 15% there may be 1 or 2% able to use education as education for the advantage or disadvantage of the public. The present political leaders are in this 1 or 2%. When they quarrel among themselves for Government posts or for their own selfish motives, they take the advantage of 99% of the illiterates, make propaganda and turn the innocent public to join their sides in order to show to the Government that there is a real demand for linguistic provinces. If to-day Andhra publicists say that Andhras want separate province or Tamil publicists say that Tamilians want separate province, it is not coming

really from the minds of the public. Only the wishes of the leaders are coming through the public, but not real public opinion. There is no way to have any real public opinion on this subject as majority of the people are illiterate, innocent and ignorant and they cannot understand either the good things or the bad things of such separation as they have no knowledge of such matters, except the advertisement made by their leaders. It is a pity and sin on the part of our prominent public leaders to drag the innocent public to win their sides for merely a temporary benefit. If they ask or fight for linguistic provinces after explaining the benefit of such separations, over and above the constitution of the provinces as at present, then there can be meaning for separation.

Unfortunately no opposition has been started for this selfish propaganda at present and nobody has taken pains to consider the dangers of separation as demanded now. But the two parties, instead of opposing each other, are demanding separation. If it is separated to-day as Andhra and Tamil, next year there may be more separations in Andhra area, as Oriya, Karnataka and Rayalaseema and in Tamil area as Christians, Hindus, Travancoreans, Cochinites, Keralas, Coimbatoreans, Tanjoreans and so on. After this separation then there will be separation of kisans, zamindars, labourers, capitalists, industrialists and then Iyers, Iyengars, Protestants, Catholics, Shias, Sunnis, Lubbais, Mudaliars, Naidus and lastly wife and husband also may have to be separated. Is this the meaning of separation? You can imagine where

this will end. There will be a fight between each and every two people. Do you call this co-operation and co-ordination for the benefit of the public? Do you want some more Pakistan tragedies, though not on a large scale, all over the country? Even a layman cannot and should not accept this policy. Of course our Government which is weakened by the fight of Kashmir and Nizam and crushed between three rollers of corruption, old red-tapism and selfishness may accept this policy as demanded now. Of course the result will be Government becoming into powder between these rollers.

One can ask why there should be separation as Bombay and Bengal Presidencies, why there should be Salem District and Coimbatore District and such other districts and why there should be taluks and villages. These separations were made for administrative purposes, for the convenience of safety and control and for general benefit of the public. If any separation is demanded or made in a better way for the administration, control, safety and general benefit of the public, nobody should object and nobody can object. The present question of separation is not based on such foundations.

Though public and government misunderstand me thinking that I am a vehement opponent of several ideas of the Congress, I am a better co operator with some of the Congress principles than several of the Congressites who call themselves co-operators. And here I am expressing my views without any prejudice.

Unfortunately India has now been made into two. Of all the blunders committed by the Congress, this one is the biggest committed on earth. This may be due to British tricks or weakness or ignorance of the Congress. We are talking every day about one wholesome cooperation, one religion and one country, but in action it seems we are going towards opposite pole. To-day we want a Hitler to make India as one India, to remove communalism and communism, to remove jealousy, selfishness, corruption, red-tapism and other devils and to make us as one country with one aim of complete cooperation for the benefit of all. I don't think the public or government are daring enough to elect an Indian Hitler. Towards this purpose if any acts or rules are passed for the safety and benefit of the public, the selfish people make a cry against the Government throughout the breadth and length of the country.

On account of weakness of leaders in the Government they are not able to carry out their duties properly. Now you can remember during and after the war how many war plans were drafted, how many post-war committees were constituted and how many times the policy of Government in social welfare, agriculture and industry was published. Just go through the account and see how many of them have been carried out. The Government can escape by saying that they are in the beginning stage only. It is true we are in the beginning. But see other countries. They have done tremendous changes. Some countries are far better now than pre-war days. On the other hand though we are not able to raise our wealth by Grow

More Food or Grow More Industries or Grow More Literacy or Grow More Health campaign, we are going down in these directions. They are wasting our funds in all these directions by mismanagement or maladministration. Instead of proportionate growth in the food we are buying more and more food from outside. Instead of increasing industries we have already reduced the industrial co-ordination. Instead of establishing big industries or cottage industries we are still importing more quantity of pins, paper clips, combs, chocolates, plastics, calculating machines, radios, motor cars, petrol and large quantities of other finished articles.

If we see our wealth, the index numbers of prices have gone up from 245 to 380. If we see our education, we are producing in our colleges very good number of criminals and sick persons. Of course we are glad nowadays we are producing more political lecturers instead of clerks in the name of students from our colleges. If we take our health we are producing large number of sick people and constructing many hospitals instead of nipping the diseases in the bud by way of taking precautionary measures and giving proper education to avoid disease.

If you see our financial position, the balance of 500 crores soon after the end of the war has now gone down to 200 crores, while our currency circulation has increased.

Take a small business or industry. It can easily grow by gradual and proper organisation. With that proper organisation, it can grow to gigantic size and can run well. Once when it is disorganised,

it is impossible to organise again to the same level by the same administrative machinery. In such case, that industry or business should be overhauled from the bottom itself. It is impossible to do anything from the top. We are seeing to-day the corruption and selfishness prevailing allover the country. Though top leaders wanted to destroy this, they were not able to do anything even in places where they are. For the administrative purpose and for the benefit of general public if separation or reorganisation is found necessary, such a change can be welcomed by one and all. For this purpose I have mentioned the reasons elaborately for the separation of South India in my speech at the All Tamilians Conference. I do not want to take your valuable time by mentioning them again.

My final opinion and request to the commission is that no linguistic provinces should be divided for the purpose of a few leaders who have been defeated in their efforts or who are going to be defeated in their efforts in near future. But, for the administrative purpose, for proper defence and for equal distribution of justice, South India should be separated as a separate state and the other portion of India may be separated as 2 or 3 groups and then all the 3 or 4 groups can be combined with a common agreement in some general subjects. If an Indian Hitler or Stalin is not coming forth, this is the only way to go forward like all other countries in the world. Otherwise we are sure the present Government whatever might be their aim, idea or desire will be crushed by other forces or ruined by themselves in a very short time.

If I am allowed to tell you the real facts of the agitation for separation and how the problem of separation originated and grew, it will be a very big history and several friends may misunderstand and therefore I do not want to deal elaborately.

Forgetting all differences, such as linguistic provinces separation, religious and caste separations, Congress, Socialist and Communist separations, let all parties join together for the uplift of our country industrially, socially, politically and economically as a strong nation and let the Government and people work harmoniously for public welfare and make India a country of full-fledged socialist states to stand as an example for other countries in the world. I hope the Commission and the Government will consider this without any prejudice, for the welfare of our country.

At the present moment when several newspapers are publishing different kinds of news about me and while several stories are prevailing about me, I do not want to state here any more details about the separation of the provinces.

I thank you all for your patient hearing.

Mr K. NANJUNDIAH B.A., B.L.

Friends, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I thought Mr Naidu would have reserved his pungent remarks about the Commission, its utility and its purpose for tomorrow when he expects all of us to come over here, perhaps in larger

numbers and with better plates and perhaps also with music of all varieties, Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil and Andhra and the only thing he might shun perhaps is the Hindustani music for he seems to urge for separation of the South from the North and while in one part he says all the separatist tendencies must vanish, he for one would say the North must say "Hands off the South". Well, that is Mr Naidu! It might be that it is a little difficult test on a party like this to criticise the host, but with Mr Naidu it is different. He wants pungent criticism. He himself indulges in it and he who attacks him most is perhaps his best friend. That is his outlook and I therefore take liberty of telling him even here in this gathering that that speech of his would have been more appropriate if he had been the leader of the opposition in the Indian Dominion Parliament rather than at this social gathering where we have met, rather we thought, we were waiting to hear the views of those who have come hear to arbitrate between the conflicting claims of these various advocates of linguistic provinces.

Well, at the outset, ladies and gentlemen, you will pardon me therefore if I summon up all my courage and dissociate myself from that scurrilous attack which Mr Naidu has indulged in either against the Government or against the advocates of linguistic provinces. Well, I may also be permitted to say that in one respect I agree with Mr Naidu that at the present juncture when we have problems relating to food, problems relating to clothing, problems relating to fight in Kashmir and problems relating to the international position which

this country has got to achieve and problems much more serious than that of getting food from wherever it is available to fight an imminent famine in this country. I for one would also agree and say that this question of linguistic provinces need not have been given so much prominence. Instead a big Commission like this has been sent to different parts of this country to find out wherever possible that food could be added where two maunds could grow where only half a maund grew now, where more mills could be situated because we are suffering from cloth shortage, perhaps all of us would have welcomed and would have been waiting at the gates of this district to give this commission such an ovation because we are all in need for it. But that does not mean that we can slight this demand for linguistic provinces. Said that the present is not the juncture, I am bound to say, that at some distant date this sort of division has got to come in for the simple reason that to-day the provinces that we have, the numerous states that we have, the very districts which have been created, have not been planned according to any system, have not come into existence on account of economic contiguity, geographical contiguity or cultural contacts but simply because in history one section or people was subdued at one time, where the poligars or zamindars were subdued another time and each man had to be accommodated according to his whims and fancies and each place has got to be preserved just to satisfy them. Now, if you see the map of India, you will find neither an arrangement, nor a proper distribution, nor even what you might call a sensible administrative arrangement of these provinces. I, therefore, am

an advocate of this distribution, according to some sensible order and as you know the cultural background is the best to know the history of the people, to know what languages they speak and to meet with the background, of course, of some measure of combining some little administrative efficiency, and such efficiency also would be the best way of dividing and administering this country. For I need not tell you, ladies and gentlemen, even if you want to construct the most magnificent structure, you cannot put up all the walls together overnight, unless of course it be of the pre-fabricated type, of which we have so much, we have got to construct the bricks, we have got to make them solid, we have got to construct the walls, we have got to plan the architecture and it must have rooms.

Mr Naidu's final conclusion that after all it may be made into two or three groups is itself a sufficient argument in my favour that there must be some plan in administering these great countries. And in so doing if the various cultures which have existed from time honoured country, if they want that they should all be brought together, I for one cannot understand how anyone can stand in a way. Even if supposing in a way freedom has been attained, when once the states have merged, the very people will feel the urge that people speaking one particular language would also like to come together and if there are minorities in certain areas their position would become a little hot. I therefore, would say that after all we will have some day to face this problem. Well, I do not want to take more of your time, for I understand Mr Naidu has many more

practical jokes and I would say that at some distant date the separation may have to come in. Because there are minorities, the best way would be to provide safeguards, I mean representation in legislatures, fostering of the languages of the minorities and economic advancement of backward territories and areas is absolutely necessary and unless such safeguards are going to be provided and those linguistic minorities are going to be carried deep, though they are safe in the hands of a linguistic majority, some sort of arrangement or distribution is necessary. I for one am not in agreement, as I told you, with all that Mr Naidu has said.

Mr C. SUBRAMANIAM B. A., B. L.

Friends,

Mr Naidu wants that I should speak in English. Though I do not like the idea of speaking in a foreign language when it is possible to talk in our own mother tongue and understand properly but still since Mr Naidu wants that our views should go before the Commission, I am speaking in a language which the Commission can understand. Mr Naidu has condemned the present agitation for the separation of provinces, the formation of provinces on the linguistic basis and looked at from the present context and circumstances this agitation may not be quite welcomed, but I am afraid he has not understood the basis on which the idea of formation of linguistic provinces was taken up.

It might be, a few individuals like Mr Naidu might believe in dictators and the dictatorial governments, but it has been agreed generally by all learned

people, politicians, scientists and everybody that hereafter it is going to be an age of democracy, and for democracy the people should have the real power, and for people to have the real power they should understand what is happening in the state, what is happening in the administration and what is happening in the Government. During the British days they were not interested in informing the people what was really going on in the state. That was not democracy. But, once we accept democracy, the state should be run in such a way so that even the common man can understand what is going on there. So far, our language, state language, has been in English. Therefore many people 99·9%- I should say, not even 99% but 99·9%- could not really understand what was really going on there. I used to say in several committee meetings, in Congress Committee meetings, that, if only the litigants come to know what the advocates really talk, many of them may not go to court at all. That is also true in respect of all the Government matters. So in order to see that a common man understands what is going on it is necessary the administration should be carried on - all the proceedings should be carried on - in a language which could be easily understood by the common man. Do you really think it possible to have English language now, as it is said, as state language and make all people understand? In spite of all our progress we have made in English education, perhaps only one per cent can follow what is going on in the English language. So, if we want the people to understand, it should be carried on in a language which they can understand and for that purpose, if it is a bi-lingual province or a mono-lingual province,

certainly the proceedings have to be carried on in a common language. That is what we find in our legislatures. We carry on our proceedings in English. It is only on that basis the Indian National Congress accepted that provinces should be formed on linguistic basis so that every person can easily understand what is going on in the Government affairs, in the legislature, in the judiciary, in the executive and in every Governmental affair. Then only, there could be real democracy.

You, people, should accept democracy as the basis for future Government. You have to accept the other thing that the common man also should be made to understand what is really going on and for that only, linguistic provinces were conceived by the Indian National Congress, and agitation also was being carried on as one of the items which should be given into effect when we get *swaraj*. But I do agree with Mr Naidu that at this present juncture when we are faced with ever so many problems, military problems in Kashmir and problems relating to Hyderabad and economic problems throughout the country, it will not be in the interest of the country to agitate for the formation of new provinces, however desirable it may be. Once a new province is formed it takes some time to adjust itself to set matters aright. It will take at least four or five years. So when our entire energy is required for the purpose of tackling such problems that are already facing us it is not good to dissipate our energy for the formation of new provinces and added to our difficulties it is only in that sense the formation of linguistic provinces is placed by the

leaders of congress. Therefore what we want is that things should be done.

We have just attained freedom. Things should be allowed to settle down, and thus formation of provinces should be taken up as soon as we set ourselves in order. Now from this point of view, I do not say anything wrong in asking for the formation of provinces on linguistic basis. That is the foundation and the basis on which this demand is made. So, Mr Naidu need not be under the impression that, simply because some power seekers want it, the basis for the demand for the formation of linguistic provinces is only by the power seekers and power politicians. So it is not that we oppose, as Mr Nanjundiah said, the formation of the linguistic provinces, but we oppose the agitation for the formation of these provinces even at this stage. That is my view in this matter. And this Mr Naidu has given expression to in his very many views which is distinctly seen, about the Governmental affairs, about prevalence or corruption and mal-administration and everything he has said to us.

Whenever we assemble here, we do not fail to hear him accusing the Government saying that there is mal-administration and corruption and so on. He should understand that we also contribute to the public and therefore once we begin to reform ourselves, to correct ourselves, automatically mal-administration, corruption and everything would go. It is only because we begin accusing others, while we want to relieve ourselves of all these, difficulties come before us – corruption, mal-administration and

all such things. I should say, I won't corrupt anybody. I won't tolerate if that is the attitude. As far as I am concerned, if that is the attitude, if each one of us take up this note, I mean this corruption, mal-administration and everything would go. After all, by any amount of legislation or by any amount of preaching by the leaders, corruption and mal-administration cannot go. The people should co-operate. It is only with the co-operation of the public, this corruption could be put down. If one person is prepared to pay Rs. 10,000/- for getting his own things done – after all he is a poor Government servent getting Rs. 50/– and every man is not above temptatian – he has simply fallen a prey, and you cannot accuse and say this is the sort of Government you are running. So, the best way of putting down corruption is that everyone should determine in free India, to see that everything goes alright and as far as we are concerned, we won't tolerate any corruption or mal-administration. In my view that would be the best way of solving it instead of accusing others. There is corruption everywhere. There is mal-administration, so far.

In his speech, many views I have heard, but I have not even heard one constructive suggestion, this is the way to end this corruption, this is the way to end mal-administration. Everything, the Government does, is wrong in his eyes. They should not collect taxes and should let everybody free. If such a view is taken, the Government cannot run. After all, the Government is only our representative, and it only reflects our views and tendencies and our moralities only. So, if the Government is bad,

only the general public morality is bad. When the general public morality is good, there would be a democratic Government. Therefore my own view is that with all his genius, intellect and equipment he should use his energies in a constructive way for the purpose of putting an end to all these things instead of simply accusing us every now and then; that everything is bad, and everything will only be for you So, I hope, even though his views about politics and other things might be queer, his views will be welcomed on the constructive side and wish that his energies are used in that respect and his view is also used for free India to see that free India is a good India too.

Mr N. LAKSHMANAN

Mr G. D. Naidu, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is neither fair nor necessary to anticipate the recommendations of the Linguistic Provinces Commission which is touring the country at present. But it is up to us to view this question with a certain background knowledge that is available. Those of us who are familiar with public life know that there have been two streams of thought in the history of the National Congress during the past sixty years. Our veteran leaders of the early period were always very particular about stressing the need for a strong Central Government, because they were, first and last, students of history. So they never lost an opportunity to impress on the public the imperative necessity of always having a strong Central Government. We may call it mere academic study; if we were to review the subject in

the light of our own war experience we find that even in the course of the past six or seven years some provinces were on the war path and you know what the result was. I simply wish to remind you of the disastrous Bengal famine, and how some surplus provinces took undue advantage of the helpless condition of Bengal and the poverty stricken inhabitants. It is obviously an eye opener. Several examples can be quoted to show that whenever provinces do not see eye to eye with the Central Government there will always be chaos in the country. This is the lesson of history. Then there has been another stream. Something like twenty years ago our Andhra friends started an agitation in favour of linguistic provinces. They carried on a raging and tearing campaign. Some of the politicians have become successful simply by repeating the subject. Thus we see that the Andhra politicians have been successful in coercing the Congress to such an extent that the Congress party is now wedded to the principle of linguistic provinces, with the result that without knowing whether there is opportunity or not, this commission has been thrust on the public. By the mere compulsion of events to quote the memorable language of Prime Minister Nehru, this commission has been forced upon us as a result of persistent agitation on the part of the Andhra brothern and the Tamil politicians are rather late by way of replying to them. So it comes to this; So long as our representatives in the provincial legislature and in the Central Government are very particular not to yield an inch of ground about the priority and the supremacy of the Central Government, everything will be safe.

You all know that during the Bengal partition of 1905–11, for six long years the whole country went mad. We did not think that the Bengal partition was a provincial affair; so we took it as an all-India affair. Separation merely as an administrative division cannot do much harm. So as long as we have got representatives in the legislatures with an all-India outlook, they can always safeguard the supremacy of the Central Government. This sort of linguistic province will not do as much harm as it is likely to do otherwise. Because for one thing though fissiparous tendencies are very common among us, at the same time, there is our national genius our age-long heritage of evolving unity out of diversity should be preserved at all cost.

Some of us can do one thing. Let us take some public interest and let several questions be studied with scientific spirit and academic accuracy. Whenever an opportunity is afforded to me to speak on this platform by our genial host Mr Naidu, I have been advocating this method of study to enable young aspirants to take a leading part in public life. I have been saying it so often that I myself thought that my cry was a cry in the wilderness. Fortunately we have the recent instance of the President and Members of the Tamil Nad Congress Committee having instituted a research bureau. So it has come to this that mere haranguing will not do when we on the threshold of running our own cabinet and particularly when we are on the eve of going in for adult franchise, all sorts of nonsense will be said by all sorts of people so that

it is very necessary for us to see that our representatives represent us in the legislatures after affairs in India and abroad equiping themselves by study and training. Otherwise as Lord Haldane pointed out in his Autobiography about Mr Lloyd George, we can only get a large set of "political illiterates" — like the blind leading the blind. We need more men of knowledge and wisdom to efficiently manage our affairs in India and abroad.

Rao Bahadur
C. M. RAMACHANDRA CHETTIAR B. A. B. L.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

When I came to-day in response to the invitation of Mr G. D. Naidu, I never thought that I would be asked to come here and say a few words about the problem which is being pressed so much. I thought, as usual, the chi f guests would be here and Mr Naidu would be giving his views by written speeches or printed speeches and he would ask the chief guests to give their views. Mr Naidu, as usual, has given his opinion in vivid terms without fear or favour as he says and we have heard his views and our friends here have also given their views. Day before yesterday, I was also one of the witnesses who appeared before the commission. The members of the commission asked several questions; of course, we had given our views in writing. Later on, a good number of questions were asked. From the mode in which the questions were put in I can

easily see the opinion of those persons. A few questions were asked as regards the boundaries which should be for the provinces. Another important point was one as regards the capital of the country, if Madras should be the capital or it should be divided into two parts, one part being given to Andhra. A good number of questions were asked as regards this question and then, one or two gentlemen, who represented the various languages had put in several other questions. For instance, he who represened Malabar, began to ask questions if portions of even Coimbatore district could be given to Malabar. He said that Malabar is too small a district to form a central province. Therefore, Coimbatore should sacrifice and give a bit to their district to form their province. His view was very curious. He asked the tract of the country between Valiar and Madukarai should be given to Malabar. It seemed to be very curious. His view was that this country was malarious, that it is not inhabited by people. On the other hand, we have to tell him that there are good number of villages in that tract mostly inhabited by Tamilians. When this answer was given there was rather an embarrassment, but the main view was expressed by the various questions which were quoted by one member of the commission. I am sure he is of opinion that the question of this problem of linguistic separation, is not necessary at present, that this is not the proper time for it, that it could be postponed. That seemed to be his opinion, because the questions were given to that effect and if such is the view of one of the important members of the commission, we can easily understand what would be the result?

At the present moment, I am sure they would merely postpone this question for another 10 years. As a matter of fact, that suggestion also was made in evidence before the commission. I am sure Mr Naidu, if he had been there, would have understood the view which had been expressed there. Such being the case, I am not surprised that Mr G. D. Naidu's views also would become successful in course of time as a result of a present investigation. Of course, if he takes the theory into consideration that each province must have a language of its own or a linguistic tract must have a province of its own, it is certainly a natural one we find it elsewhere also.

If you take Europe into consideration, each country has got a language of its own; in India why not such a question could come in? That is a question which would occur to every one of us. Certainly if times are auspicious, if everything goes on well, the country could be divided on linguistic basis. But, what is the fun of adding Kollegal to Karnataka if Mysore would not come in. The distance between Kollegal and the Karnataka tracts of Deccan is more than 250 miles and what is the fun of separating Malabar into a separate province if Cochin and Travancore do not wish to come in. If these problems are considered well, then everybody would think that this is not the time for linguistic separation at all. Time may come in sometime hence. We do not know when. Then we could easily consider the whole question and come to some definite conclusion.

Mr. N. J. RAJAGOPAL

I agree with Mr Naidu's views expressed on the Linguistic Provinces commission.

The Government of India need not have appointed such a commission at this juncture. The move of the Government is ill-conceived and ill-sponsored. There are already different elements in India who obstruct all the constructive programmes. It is not fair on the part of the Government to attempt to divide Madras Province into four parts as Tamils, Andhras, Karnatakas and Keralas.

The accusation against the British Government that it has attempted to rule India, by Divide and Rule Policy is true; it is also true that the same accusation can be brought against the Government of India. If the Government of India wants to divide Madras Province into four provinces, it is just adding to the dissensions willingly in South India. If the province is disunited, there can never be any organisation or unity. If really there is any splitting up of the province, it is an economic tragedy that shall never be got over.

There is already a movement for the separation of South India from the North. The Government of India could not have ignored this movement though they may pretend that they were not aware of it. This movement is gaining momentum. It is also a just demand. It avoids unnecessary dissertation on linguistic basis. Tamils, Malayalees, Andhras and Karnatakas are culturally and

geographically one race. Their culture and civilisation are different from those of the North. So the demand for the separation of South India is justifiable. If the Linguistic Provinces commission, on the other hand, tries to patch up the differences, it is heartily welcome. Tamil language is the mother tongue for all the Dravidian languages.

It emanates into Tamilians, Malayalees, Karnatakas and the influence of the language tegether with common customs can bring all these people into one and that can be easily done. It is good for administration and for co-operation of all the elements.

The origin of the separation of this province into four units owes its existence because some Prime Minister of Andhra Community is lost in the gamble of ballots, or some ministers are lost in the gamble of power positions. Justifying this the Government of India should have sponsored this move—it is really a tragedy. The Government should have taken the public opinion. The public opinion has never been cared for. Even if some body comes forth to offer any opinion, the opinions expressed are never sincere and real. They do not give their opinions from their heart of hearts. When there is lot of illiterates in the country and when they form the majority, public opinion can never be had. So this is also the case with the Linguistic Provinces commission. So if I were to offer my opinion I shall say "Go back Linguistic Provinces Commission".

மா. திருஞானசம்பந்தம்.

பேரன்பு மிக்க பெரியோர்களே! தோழர்களே!

வணக்கம்.

இம்மொழிவழி நாட்டுப் பிரிவினைக் குழுவினர்க்கு அறநெறியில் நேரிய முறையில் பிரிவினையின் உண்மை அடிப்படைக் காரணங்கள் நாட்டவரால் நன்கு அறிவிக்கப்படுமா? அவ்வாறு ஒரு சில அறிஞரால் அறிவிக்கப்படினும் குழுவினர் அவற்றை ஏற்கும் முறை எவ்வாறு இருக்கும்? ஏற்பின் ஆட்சியாளருக்கு அனுப்பப்படும் அறிக்கை எத்தகையதாயமையும்? ஆள்வோர் அவ்வறிக்கையினை அப்படியே ஏற்பார்களா? ஏற்றாலும் செயல் முறையில் கொணர்வார்களா? கொண்டு வந்தாலும் அதன் எதிர் விளைவு எவ்வாறிருக்கும் என்பவற்றையெல்லாம் இக்குறுகிய கால அளவில் யான் கூற விரும்பவில்லை.

இந்நாட்டுக் குடிமக்களின் முன் வரிசையில் இடம் பெற்றுள்ள பலரும் தாம் புராணக்கதைகளிற் படித்துள்ள நரகத்தைப்பற்றிக் கேள்விப்பட்டதும் அஞ்சி அதனை அறுவறுப்பதுபோன்று பிரிவினை என்ற சொல்லைக் கேட்ட உடனே அதனைச் சிறிதும் சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்காமல் அஞ்சி அறுவறுத்து அகற்றிவிடுகின்றனர். அங்ஙனம் அஃது அகற்றப்பட்டபின் அதன் பொருட்டு எவ்வளவுதான் நேரிய காரணங்கள் காட்டப்படினும் அவர்கள் தெளிவடைவதில்லை. இவர்களின் நிலையே இதுவானால் தாம் குடிமக்கள் என்பதனையோ, தமக்கும் இத்திட்டத்திற்கும் உள்ள தொடர்பும் பங்கும் இத்தகையன என்பவற்றையோ ஒரு சிறிதும் அறிய வாய்ப்பற்ற இந்நாட்டு பெரும்பான்மை மக்களின் நிலையினைக் கூறவும் வேண்டுமா? ஆகவே, இந்நாட்டுப் பெரியோர்கள் — அறிஞர்கள் — முற்போக்காளர்கள் — அனைவரும் முதலில் தம் அச்சத்தை அகற்றிவிட்டு சிந்தனைக்கு இடந்தரவேண்டும்.

அறிவியல் துறையில் ஒரு பொருளினை பிரிக்கப் பிரிக்கப் புத்தம் புதிய ஆற்றல்கள் வெளிப்பட்டு வியக்கத்தக்க பெரும் பயன்களை விளைப்பதைக் காண்கின்றோம். அது போன்றே பல்வேறு ஆற்றல்கள் ஒன்று சேரச்சேர அது பேராற்றலாகிப் பெரும்பயன் விளைப்பதையும் காண்கின்றோம். பிரிவினையிலும் நன்மை உண்டு, சேர்க்கையிலும் நன்மையுண்டு. இவற்றால் விளையும் கேடுகளும் இல்லாமலில்லை. ஒரு பொருளின் பண்டைய நிலை; அதன் இயல்பு; பிரிக்கவோ சேர்க்கவோ அமையும் இன்றியமையாக் காரணம்; அறிவினால் முன்னதாகவே உணர்ந்து எதிர்பார்க்கப் படும் இன்ப நல் விளைவு; பிரிவு அல்லது சேர்க்கை இவற்றின் எல்லையளவு ஆகியவற்றைப் பொறுத்தே பிரிவினை அல்லது சேர்க்கையின் இன்ப துன்ப விளைவுகளும் அமைகின்றன.

அந்த முறையின்படியே "இந்தியா" என்று இக்காலத்தில் அழைக்கப்படும் ஒரு கண்டம் போன்ற இந்நாட்டின் நிலையினைப் பார்ப்போம். இந்நாடு ஆங்கிலேயரின் ஆட்சிக்கு உட்படுவதன்முன் வேத, புராண, இதிகாச வரலாற்றுக் காலங்கள் எல்லாவற்றிலும் ஒன்றுபட்டு இருந்ததாகவோ, ஓர் ஆளுகைக்குட்பட்டு வாழ்ந்ததாகவோ எத்தகைய ஆதாரமும் இல்லாததோடு, தனித்தனிப் பிரிந்து நின்று தன்னரசோச்சியதாகத்தான் ஏராளமான ஆதாரங்கள் கிடைக்கின்றன. அதிலும் சிறப்பாக தென்னிந்தியா என்று அழைக்கப்படும் திராவிடநாடு அசோகன் போன்ற வல்லரசர்களின் காலங்களிற்கூட தனித்தே வாழ்ந்து வந்திருக்கிறதென்பது வரலாறுகூறும் உண்மையாகும்.

மற்று இந்நாட்டின் இயல்பினைக் கூர்ந்து நோக்கினால் திராவிடநாட்டினுடையவும், வடநாட்டினுடையவும் கலை, மொழி, நாகரிகம், பண்பு, பழக்க வழக்கம், வாழ்க்கை முறை ஆகிய பலவும் சேர்ந்தால் ஒன்றை ஒன்று அழிக்கக்கூடிய முரண்பாடுள்ளனவாகவும், இயலாத சூழ்நிலையிலும் எண்ணெயும் நீரும்போல் தனித்தே நிற்பனவாயும் அமைந்திருப்பதை இன்றும் காணலாம். மக்களுள்ளும் திராவிடர்

வடவரை வெறுப்பதும், வடவர் தென்னவரை வெறுப்பதும் நாடாளும் பெருந்தலைவர்களும் சொல்லித்தீர வேண்டிய நிலைமை வேரூன்றி நிற்கின்றது.

மேலும் அறிவினால் உய்த்துணர்ந்து எதிர்பார்க்கப் படும் பின்விளைவுகளுள் ஒரு சிலவற்றைக் கூறவிழைகின் றேன். பிரிவினையால் பொதுவாக எல்லாப் பகுதிகளும் பயனடையலாம் என்று எதிர்பார்க்கப்படினும் சிறப்பாக தென் பகுதிக்கு — திராவிடத்திற்கு — பெரும் பயன் விளையும் என திண்ணமாகவும், தெளிவாகவும், ஐயத்திற்கிட மின்றி எதிர்பார்க்கப்படுகின்றது. முதற்கண் திராவிடம் வடநாட்டினின்றும், தொழில், வாணிபம், பொருளாதாரம், அரசியல் ஆதிக்கம், ஆகியவற்றினின்றும் விடுபட்டு விடுதலை எய்தும். எய்தினால்,

(1) இந்நாட்டில் கிடைக்கும் பல்வேறு வகைப்பட்ட மூலப்பொருள்களையும் இங்கு எளிதில் கிடைக்கும் தொழி லாளரின் உதவியினால் செய்பொருள்களாக்கி தொழில் துறையில் முன்னேற முடியும். இதனால் இருவகை நன் மைகள் ஏற்படும். (ஒன்று) தொழில் வளத்தால் பொருள் வளம் பெறுதல். (இரண்டு) வயிற்றுப்பிழைப்பிற்காக மலேயா தென்னாப்பிரிக்கா போன்ற வெளிநாடுகளிற் சென்று வதையும் இந்நாட்டுப் பெருங்குடி மக்களை மீட்டு அவர்களுக்கு நல்வாழ்வளித்தல்.

(2) கடு வட்டி வாங்கி எளிய மக்களைக் கசக்கிப்பிழி யும் மார்வாரிகளின் இரும்புப்பிடியினின்றும் தென்னாட்டுப் பாட்டாளி மக்களை விடுவிக்கலாம்.

(3) செருப்பு முதல் சிமண்ட் வரை ஆணி முதல் ஆடைஅணி வரை உள்ள வடநாட்டு வாணிபச் சுரண்டலி னின்றும் திராவிடத்தை மீட்கமுடியும்.

(4) முற்போக்குச் சக்திமிக்க தென்னாட்டு ஆட்சிக்கு பிற்போக்குச் சக்தியே நிரம்பியுள்ள வடநாட்டு ஆட்சியின் ஏதேச்சாதிகாரத்தினின்றும் விடுதலையளிக்கலாம். தென்

னாட்டு ஆட்சி முற்போக்கானது என்பதற்கும் வடநாட் டாட்சி பிற்போக்கு நிறைந்ததென்பதற்கும் ஒரு எடுத்துக் காட்டாவது தருதல் இங்கு தேவை எனக்கருதுகிறேன். திராவிட நாட்டு ஆட்சியாளர் அண்மையில் மதுவிலக்கு, ஜமீன் இனாம் ஒழிப்பு ஆகிய துறைகளில் முன்னேறத் தொடங்கினர். உடனே பிற்போக்கு நிறைந்த வடவர் ஆதிக்கம் முன்னேற விடாது தடுத்து திராவிடத்தை பின் னுக்குத் தள்ளியது நீங்கள் அறியாததல்ல. எனவே பிரி வினையால் இத்தகைய பல காரணங்களாலும் திராவிடநாடு பல்வேறு துறைகளிலும் முன்னேறி உலக நாடுகளனைத்தி லும் முன்னணியில் நிற்கமுடியும் என்பது தெற்றென எதிர் பார்க்கப்படுகிறது.

மேலும் தென்னாடு வடநாட்டினின்றும் பிரிந்தே தீர வேண்டுமென்பதற்கு பல அறிஞர்கள் ஏராளமான காரணங் களை எடுத்துக்கூறி நன்கு விளங்கியுள்ளனர். மத்திய ஆட்சியின் பேரால் வரி என்ற முறையில் இங்கிருந்து வட நாடு கொண்டு செல்லப்படும் கோடிக்கணக்கான பொருள் களை இங்கேயே நிறுத்தி இந்நாட்டுப் பாதுகாப்பிற்கும், தொழிற்றுறை வளர்ச்சிக்கும், பிற மறுமலர்ச்சி ஆக்கவேலை கட்கும் பயன் படுத்தினால் இந்நாடு உலகிலேயே தலை சிறந்து விளங்கும் என்பதனை யெல்லாம் தெளிவுபடுத்தி யுள்ளனர். அல்லாமல் மொழி, கலை, பண்பாடு, நாகரிகம் போன்றவற்றை யெல்லாம் எடுத்து விளக்கப்புகுந்தால் கால மும் உங்கள் பொறுமையும் அளவு கடந்துவிடும் என அஞ்சி அவற்றை யெல்லாம் விட்டுவிடுகிறேன்.

அங்ஙனம் பிரிக்கப்படும் தென்னாட்டினை சீரும் சிறப் பும் பெருக ஆளுவதற்கேற்ற அறிஞர்களில்லை என்றுகூட கூறிவிடமுடியாது. இப்பொழுது இந்திய யூனியன் ஆட்சி யினை உண்மையாக நடத்துவோர் திராவிட நாட்டவரே என்று கூறினால் அதுமிகையாகாதென்று எண்ணுகிறேன். உலக முழுவதும் இந்திய யூனியனின் சார்பாகச் சென்று

வர்தாடி இந்நாட்டிற்கேற்படும் பல்வேறு முட்டுப்பாடுகளையும் களைந்து இந்நாட்டின் மானத்தையும் காத்து நமக்கு நல்வாழ்வளிக்கும் சர் ஏ. இராமசாமி யார்? பன்னெடுங் காலமாகத் தீராத்தலைவலிப் பிரச்சினையாக இருந்துவந்த 'ஸ்டர்லிங்' பிரச்சினையை எளிதாக சிக்கலின்றி தீர்த்தும், புதிய விடுதலைபெற்ற இந்நாட்டின் முதல் பொருளாதார திட்டத்தை வகுத்தும் தெளிவளித்த சர் சண்முகம் யார்? இந்திய யூனியனின் முதல் இந்திய கவர்னர் ஜனரலாக விளங்கும் அரசியல் சூழ்ச்சிமிக்க சி. இராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியார் யார்? மற்றும் மத்திய ஆட்சியின் முக்கிய பொறிகளாக விளங்கும் ஜான்மத்தாய், கோபாலசாமி, சந்தானம் போன்றவர்களெல்லாம் யாவர்? தென்னாட்டின் — திராவிடநாட்டின் — கோஹினூர் வைரங்களல்லவா? முன்கூறிய திராவிட அறிஞர்களின் உதவி இன்றேல் மத்திய ஆட்சி எத்தனை நாட்களுக்கு நிலைக்க முடியுமென்று கேட்கின்றேன். இவ்வுலகு புகழ்பெற்ற பேரறிஞர்களை வைத்துக்கொண்டு இத்திராவிட கூட்டரசினை உலகத்திற்கே ஆட்சிமுறை கற்பிக்க வல்ல உன்னத நாடாக ஆளமுடியாதா என்று கேட்கின்றேன். மற்றும் தொழிற்றுறைப் பேரறிஞர் ஜி. டி. நாயுடு, அறிவியல் அறிஞர் சர் சி. வி. இராமன் போன்ற எண்ணற்ற அறிஞர்களின் உண்மை உழைப்பால் இத்திராவிடநாட்டை ஓர் ஒப்பற்ற அறிவியல் நாடாகவும், கதைகளிற் காணப்படும் கற்பனை வானுலகம் போன்ற உண்மைப்பேரின்ப நாடாக ஆக்கமுடியாதா என்று நன்றாக எண்ணிப்பாருங்கள். வடநாட்டுச் சர்வாதிகாரப் பிடிப்பு இங்கு இருப்பதாலல்லவா இவ்வளவு பேராற்றல்களும் அவற்றால் விளையும் பெரும் பயன்களும் ஒன்றுக்குமுதவாமல் பாழ்பட்டுப் போகின்றன. இந்நிலையினை எண்ணினால் நெஞ்சம் வேகவில்லையா? இதற்கு மாற்றந்தேட வேண்டாமா?

இதுவரை யான்கூறி வந்தவற்றிலிருந்து தென்னாடு வடநாட்டினின்றும் பிரிந்தாக வேண்டும் என்பது பெறப்பட்டது. ஆனால் அப்பிரிவினைக்கும் ஓர் எல்லை உண்டல்லவா? அளவின்றிப் பிரிந்து கொண்டே போனால் அது

குடும்பத்தில் தலைவன் தலைவிப் பிரிவினைவரை சென்று எல்லையின்றிப் போவதுடன் முன் எதிர்பார்க்கப்பட்ட ஆக்க நலன்களையும் அடையமுடியாமற் போகும். தமிழ், தெலுங்கு, கேரளம், கன்னடம் ஆகிய தென்பகுதி களனைத்தும் கூட்டாட்சி அடிப்படையில் ஒன்றுசேர்ந்து 'திராவிட நாடு' என்ற பெயரால் வடவர் ஆதிக்கத்தி னின்றும் பிரிவதுதான் எல்லாவகையாலும் ஏற்புடைய தாகும். இவ்வாறன்றி ஒரு சிலர் ஒரு சில தனிப்பட்ட காரணங்களுக்காகக் கூறுவதுபோல தமிழகம், ஆந்திரம், கேரளம், கர்னாடகம் என்று மொழிவழிப்பிரிவது பொருத் தமாகத் தோன்றவில்லை. பிரிவினைக்கு மொழி வேறுபாடு ஒன்றையே அடிப்படையாகக் கொள்வது முறையுமல்ல. ரஷ்யாவில் பலமொழி பேசும் பல பகுதிகள் பிற ஒற்றுமை யின் காரணமாக ஒன்றி வாழவில்லையா? எனவே இனம், கலை, நாகரிகம், மொழியின் அடிப்படை, பண்பாடு ஆகிய பல்லாற்றாலும் ஒன்றுபட்டுள்ள தென்னாட்டை மொழியின் மேற்போக்கான வேறுபாடு ஒன்றையே கருதி தனித்தனியே பிரிப்பது நல்லதல்ல. அவ்வாறு பிரித்தால் தொழில், பொருளாதாரம் ஆகிய துறைகளில் ஆக்க வேலைகள் செய் வதற்கு அரிதாவதோடு சிறுபான்மையோர் பிரச்சினை — தமிழகத்தில் ஆந்திரர், ஆந்திரத்தில் தமிழர், கேரளத்தில் தமிழர் ஆந்திரர் ஆகியோர் நிலை — தீர்க்கமுடியாத பெருந் தொல்லைகளை விளைவிக்கும். இப்பகுதிகளிலுள்ள எல் லாத் துறைகளினின்றும் ஆரியத்தை மட்டும் அகற்றிவிட் டால் இந்நான்கு பகுதிகளும் ஒன்றுபட்ட ஒரே நாடாக இயங்குவதைக் காணலாம். பிரிவினையில் உள்ள எல்லை அளவினைப் போலவே சேர்க்கை முறையிலும் சில குறிப் பிட்ட அளவில் — வெளிநாட்டு படையெடுப்பு, தொழில், வாணிப ஒப்பந்தங்கள் ஆகியவற்றில் மட்டும் — வடநாட்டுட னும், பிற உலக நாடுகளுடனும் உடன்படிக்கைகள் செய்து கொண்டு சேர்க்கையால் விளையும் நலன்களையும் எய்தலாம்.

இனி இப்பிரிவினையை மறுக்கின்றவர்கள் பாதுகாப்பு, வடக்கிற்கும் தெற்கிற்கும் இடையே பெரியமலைகள்

போன்ற இயற்கை அரண் இன்மையையும் குறிப்பிடுவர். தற்காப்புத் துறையில் திராவிட வீரரின் திறன் கடந்த உலகப் போரிலும், வடநாட்டுக் குழப்பம், ஐதராபாத் போராட்டம் ஆகியவற்றிலும் மெய்ப்பிக்கப்பட்டது. அல்லாமலும் முப்புறமும் கடல் சூழ்ந்துள்ள திராவிடம் கடற்படையில் சிறந்து விளங்கும் என்பதோடு வடநாடு இரவல் கேட்கும் அளவுக்குமிக்கு விளங்கும் என்றும் கூறுவேன்.

மற்றும் கடல் மலை போன்றவற்றால் அரண் செய்யப்படவில்லை எனக்கூறுவதும் சரியல்ல. ஏனெனில் மலையரணும், கடலரணும், வான ஊர்தியும், நீராவிக்கப்பலும் பெருகியுள்ள இக்காலத்திற்கு அரண் செய்யமாட்டா. ஏதாவது இயற்கை எல்லை என்று ஒன்று வேண்டுமாயின் விந்தியமலை இருக்கின்றது. மேலும் மேலை நாடுகளிற் பல தம்முள் இயற்கை அரணாற் பிரிக்கப்படாமலேயே பிரிந்து நின்று தனியாட்சி செலுத்தவில்லையா? என்று கேட்கின்றேன். ஆகவே படையாற்றல், பொருளாற்றல், தொழில் ஆற்றல், மூலப் பொருளாற்றல், வடநாட்டு ஆட்சி மன்றத்திற்கு கடன் தந்துள்ள அறிவாற்றல், அறிவியலாற்றல், நீர், நில, மக்கள், வளப்ப ஆற்றல் ஆகிய எல்லா ஆற்றல்களும் பெற்று முற்போக்குப் பண்பும் நிறைந்துள்ள தென்னாடு — திராவிடம் — வடநாட்டிலிருந்தும் பிரிந்து ஏன் நல் வாழ்வு வாழலாகாது என்று கேட்கின்றேன்.

தனித்து நின்ற சிறு நாடுகளனைத்தும் எப்பாடுபட்டன என்பதனைச் சென்ற உலகப் பெரும்போரில் கண்டிருந்தும் மேலும் நாட்டினைத் துண்டுபோடுதல் முறையா என்று கேட்கின்றனர் சிலர். யான் அவர்களுக்கு பெரும் பெரும் நாடுகள் மட்டும் தொல்லையின்றி வாழ்ந்தனவா? என்று கேட்பதன் வாயிலாகத்தான் பதில் கூறக்கூடும். அணுக்குண்டுக்காலத்தில் நாட்டின் பரப்பையும் மக்கள் எண்ணிக்கையையும்கூறிப் பூச்சாண்டி காட்டுவது ஒன்று ஏளனமாயிருக்கவேண்டும் அல்லது ஏமாற்றுதலாக இருக்கவேண்டுமேயல்லாது வேறில்லை. தென்னாட்டின் நலத்துக்கும்

பாதுகாப்புக்கும் ஆகவாவது வடநாட்டோடு சேர்ந்து இருக்க வேண்டும் என்பதும் நீரில் நீந்தத் தெரிந்த ஒருவன் நீந்தத் தெரியாத மற்றொருவனை பெரிய வெள்ளத்தில் வலிய சுமந்து செல்லுவதாகக் கூறுவதைப் போன்றதே. இக்கூற்றும் ஒன்று பயித்தியக்காரத்தனமாக இருக்கவேண்டும் அல்லது இத்திருநாட்டை என்றென்றும் தங்கள் ஆதிக்கத்தின்கீழ் வைத்திருக்கச் செய்யப்படும் சூழ்ச்சியாக இருக்க வேண்டும். எனவே இவ்விரு சாராருக்கும் ஏற்பட்டுள்ள கசப்புமுற்றி பகைவெறியாக மாறுவதன் முன்னரே இரு வேறியல்புகொண்ட இருவேறு நாடுகளையும் தனித்தனியே பிரித்து விடுதல்தான் முன்னறிவுடையோர் செயலாகும். இந்தியருக்கும் ஆங்கிலேயருக்கும் இருந்த மனக்கசப்பு வளருகிறது, அதனை எவ்வகையாலும் மாற்றமுடியாது என்பதனைக் கண்டுகொண்ட ஆங்கிலேயர்கள் தமது பரம்பரை அறிவுச் சூழ்ச்சியினைப் பயன்படுத்தி கசப்பு முற்றுவதன்முன் விடுதலை நல்கியதாற்றான் இங்கிலாந்தும் இந்தியாவும் நட்புறவு நாடுகளாக வாழமுடிகிறது. அன்றி பாக்கிஸ்தான் பிரிவினையில் இந்தியத் தலைவர்கள் நடந்து கொண்டதைப்போல இறுதிவரை முரட்டுப்பிடிவாதத்துடனேயே இருந்துவிட்டால் பின் விளைவுயாதாகுமோ ?, என்று பெரிதும் அஞ்சுகின்றேன். நாட்டு நலத்தில் நாட்டமுள்ளோர் அனைவரும் என்னைப் போலவே இதற்குப் பெரிதும் அஞ்சுவர் என்பதும் உறுதி. எனவே பாக்கிஸ்தான் இந்துஸ்தான் பகைமையையே, வடநாடு தென்னாட்டினிடையேயும் வளர்த்துக் கொண்டிருக்காமல் நேரிய முறையில், சமாதானமாகவே, கசப்பு முற்றுவதன் முன்பாகவே பிரிவினைக் கிடந்தருவதன் மூலமாக இவ்விரு நாடுகளும் நட்புறவு நாடுகளாகவேவாழ நாட்டின் பெருந்தலைவரோன் போர் வழிவகை செய்வார்களாக !, என வேண்டி இப்பெறலரும் வாய்ப்பளித்தமைக்கு உரியார்க்கு நன்றியும் பகர்ந்து என் உரைகளை முடித்துக்கொள்கின்றேன்.